

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed October 5, 2007, claims 1-18 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 13-15, 17, and 18. Applicants have also canceled claims 7 and 16. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Pesin for participating in a telephonic examiner's interview on January 17, 2007, in which Stephen Schaefer participated on behalf of Applicants. During the interview the outstanding obviousness rejection of claim 1 was discussed, as well as the references upon which the rejection was based. No agreement was reached, but the Examiner agreed that Applicants' positions would be duly considered in a response.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103: CLAIMS 1-6, 8-15, AND 17-18

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,663 to Ravenscroft et al. ("Ravenscroft") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,789 to Anderson et al. ("Anderson"). Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft in view of Anderson further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,556 to Judkins et al. Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft in view of Anderson further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2003/0137536 A1 to Hugh. Claims 7, 10-12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft in view of Anderson further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,397 to Chee et al.

Applicants submit that, as amended, each of the independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 18 define subject matter that is patentable over the combination of Ravenscroft and Anderson, as do the dependent claims. In addition, Applicants submit that the references cited in connection with the dependent claims do not cure the deficiencies of Ravenscroft and Anderson with respect to the independent claims.

Ravenscroft relates to a monitoring system client for a call center. (Title.) Ravenscroft discusses a monitoring system that may display status information and statistics regarding agent activity as part of a graphical user interface. (Col. 1, lines 33-36.) Ravenscroft further discusses

that the monitoring system may enable a supervisor to view information regarding all of the agents under supervision. (Col. 1, lines 38-41.) Ravenscroft also discusses that multiple views may be available via the monitoring system, for example, a view that depicts all of the agents in the call center as well as views that depict selected subsets of the agents within the call center.

Anderson discusses task and resource automation of call center management. (Title.) Call center resources can be grouped into relationship profiles and a relationship key field corresponding to the relationship profiles can then be used to organize and display statistics within the call center. (Abstract.). A strategy and action management system and method permits the user to build customized actions and to create strategy profiles. (Id.) A statistics display system presents the call center statistics in different user-defined views, for example, corresponding to one of the relationship profiles. (Id.)

Neither Ravenscroft nor Anderson, alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious “a number of customers present in each of multiple customer queues, wherein the multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels and are being serviced by the selected group of interaction center agents” as recited in the independent claims. The business type area discussed by Ravenscroft displays information associated with a business client (e.g., icon, name, and number of calls processed) (Ravenscroft, col. 7, lines 21-26), but there is no mention or suggestion that the business clients are organized in queues to accommodate different customer priority levels. Anderson fails to remedy the deficiencies of Ravenscroft. The Service Level statistics discussed by Anderson relate to call center tasks, i.e., inbound and outbound calls, email and web chats, etc. (Anderson, col. 11, lines 25-38), not “multiple customer queues, wherein the multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels” as recited in the independent claims. Like Ravenscroft, Anderson neither discusses nor suggests organizing business clients in queues to accommodate different customer priority levels.

Ravenscroft and Anderson, separately or together, also fail to teach or suggest “displaying for each listed agent . . . information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time” as recited in the independent claims. The statistics displayed by Ravenscroft and Anderson are related to either the present or the past and not the future as recited in the independent claims. (Ravenscroft, col. 9, lines 21-32 and Anderson, col. 15, lines

10-53). Neither reference anticipates or suggests displaying information pertaining to the availability of a listed agent during a future period of time.

As such, the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or give rise to a prima facie case of obviousness for any of Applicants' independent claims 1, 8, 17, or 18. Furthermore, the cited references do not anticipate or give rise to a prima facie case of obviousness for any of Applicants' claims 2-6 and 9-15 each of which depends, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 8, 17, and 18.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 06-1050 in the total amount of \$1860 for the Request for Continued Examination fee and the Petition for Extension of Time fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 2, 2008



Stephen R. Schaefer
Reg. No. 37,927

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696
60459901.doc